

REMARKS

Presently claims 1-23 are pending in this application. Claims 3 and 10 have been cancelled. Claims 1-2, 4-10, 12-13, 20, and 23 have been amended.

Objections to the Drawings

The Examiner objects to the Drawings for not identifying the “bypass,” “further processing device,” or “coin insertion slot.” Applicant respectfully points out that the bypass is identified by reference character 11 and the coin insertion slot is identified by reference character 13. “The further processing device” has been respectfully amended to be recited in the claims as the “processing device,” which is identified by reference character 6.

Applicant respectfully submits that this objection is now overcome.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

Claims 1-8, 12 and 23 are variously rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph for allegedly not particularly pointing out or distinctly claiming the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The specific points of this rejection will now be addressed in turn.

Claims 1-8 are rejected for omission of an essential step. In response to this rejection, Applicant has respectfully amended claim 1 to recite a providing of at least one pair of rollers.

Claim 3 is rejected because the phrase “wherein the coins to the pair of rollers” is unclear. In response, Applicant has cancelled claim 3.

Claim 4 is rejected because the phrase “rotated as a function of coin supply” is unclear. In response Applicant has amended claim 4 to recite “rotated *in response* to the coin supply.”

Claims 7 and 8 are rejected for lack of clarity. In response the claims have been amended to recite a skipping as opposed to a passing by.

Claim 12 is rejected because a “further processing device” is unclear. In response, Applicant has amended claim 12 to recite a “processing device” as opposed to a “further processing device.”

Claim 23 is rejected for use of the term “sensor” as a capturer of contaminants. In response, Applicant amended the claim to recite a “detecting” of contaminants as opposed to a capturing” of contaminants.

Applicant respectfully submits that at least in light of the above amendments and remarks, the 112 rejections are overcome.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1-6, 9-11, 16, 17, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese Patent No. 0,516,032 to Okuda (“Okuda” hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant’s claim 1 recites *inter alia*,

“providing at least one pair of rollers for separation of the coins regardless of their value, the rollers being spaced so that so that a space between the rollers is larger than a thickness of a thickest of the coins but smaller than twice a thickness of a smallest of the coins.”

Okuda does not teach rollers that are spaced so that the space between the rollers is larger than a thickness of a thickest of the coins but smaller than twice a thickness of a smallest of the coins. Instead, the abstract and Figures of Okuda seem to teach an apparatus configured to accept coins of a single size. In addition, referring in particular to Figures 3 and 4, Okuda teaches a space between the rollers that allows a passing of multiple coins at once. In contrast, Applicant’s amended claim 1 recites the space between the rollers to be *smaller than twice a*

thickness of a smallest of the coins. As such, for at least these reasons, Okuda does not teach every element of Applicant's claims.

Applicant also wishes to note that the rockers of Okuda are not taught to be rotated, but instead swing in a reciprocative manner.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth hereinabove, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1, and claims 2 and 4-6 that depend therefrom are not anticipated by Okuda.

Furthermore, claim 9 has also been amended to recite *inter alai*,

“rollers being spaced from each other so that a space between the rollers is larger than a thickness of a thickest of the coins but smaller than twice a thickness of a smallest of the coins”

As such, for at least the reasons set forth with regards to claim 1, claim 9 and claims 11, 16, 17, 21, and 22 which depend from claim 9, are also not anticipated by Okuda.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over United States Patent No. 4,558,711 to Yoshiaki (“Yoshiaki” hereinafter) in view of Okuda. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant again respectfully points out that Applicant's amended claims 1 and 9 recite *inter alia*,

“rollers being spaced from each other so that a space between the rollers is larger than a thickness of a thickest of the coins but smaller than twice a thickness of a smallest of the coins”

With reference to the 102 arguments above, Okuda does not teach rollers that are spaced so that the space between the rollers is larger than a thickness of a thickest of the coins but smaller than twice a thickness of a smallest of the coins. Instead, the abstract and Figures of Okuda seem to teach an apparatus configured to accept coins of a single size. In addition, referring in particular to Figures 3 and 4, Okuda teaches a space between the rollers that allows a passing of multiple coins at once. In contrast, Applicant's amended claim 1 recites the space between the rollers to be *smaller than twice a thickness of a smallest of the coins*. As such, Applicant's claims 1 and recite a space that will allow only one coin at a time can pass between the rollers. For at least these reasons, Okuda does not teach every element of Applicant's claims.

Furthermore, Applicant also wishes to note that the rockers of Okuda are not taught to be rotated, but instead are taught to be connected via a bail that allows angle movement in a reciprocative manner. In contrast, the space between the rollers of Applicant's disclosure includes a fixed non-adjustable distance.

Yoshiaki does not remedy the deficiencies of Okuda as discussed above. Yoshiaki does not teach an apparatus that could employ rollers at all. Instead, Yoshiaki teaches a disk and a conveyer belt system.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth hereinabove, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 1 and 9, and claims 2, 4-8, and 11-22 that depend variously therefrom, are not obvious over the combination of Yoshiaki and Okuda.

Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Okuda in view of United States Patent No. 6,484,884 to Gerrity et al. ("Gerrity" hereinafter). Applicant respectfully traverses.

For at least the reasons set forth with regards to claims 1-22, Okuda does not teach every element of Applicant's claim 9. Thus, as claim 23 depends from claim, Okuda also does not teach every element of Applicant's claim 23

Gerrity does not remedy the deficiencies of Okuda as discussed above. Gerrity instead teaches a purifying apparatus for coins.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth hereinabove, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 23 is not obvious over the combination of Okuda and Gerrity.

Applicant also notes that the prior art made of record but not relied on, United States Patent No. 4,320,854 to Hirose, is not related to a coin apparatus, and as such, a person of ordinary skill in the art would not consider this disclosure.

The prior art rejections herein overcome. Entry of the present Response with Amendment and issuance of a Notice of Allowance are respectfully requested.

Applicant hereby petitions for a three-month extension of time.

Please charge any fees due with respect to this Response, or otherwise regarding the application, to Deposit Account 06-1130 maintained by Applicant's attorneys.

The Office is invited to contact Applicants' attorneys at the below-listed telephone number regarding this Response or otherwise concerning the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Daniel R. Gibson
Registration No. 56,539
CANTOR COLBURN LLP
55 Griffin Road South
Bloomfield, CT 06002
Telephone (860) 286-2929
Facsimile (860) 286-0115
Customer No. 23413

Date: March 29, 2007